Prefer aff interps because A) the 7-4 timeskew in favor of the negative and B) the negative has the ability to adapt to the AC whereas the affirmative can never adapt the neg strat because I speak first because the 1AR.

And Aff wins on Theory since I’m *forced* to adopt some reading of the topic in the AC, and letting the neg argue that another reading might have been slightly better is infinitely possible and thus unreciprocal.

And Theory against the AC should be an RVI since a) I wouldn’t otherwise have access to offense on that level of the debate which is unreciprocal, b) adding a layer to the debate that only the neg can win exacerbates the aff’s timeskew, and c) the negative has the opportunity to adapt their arguments to meet my interpretation, so topicality should be a game-over issue either way.

And don’t vote me down for violating Theory since a) we still have time to debate after the AC and thus maintain the educational integrity of the round and b) this nullifies 6 minutes of AC speech time causing a skew.

Part 1: Parametrics

We can assume that the actor is human because the resolution questions how to value something, which is impossible by some form of governmental agent since a) there is no way to aggregate different collective thoughts because each thought would only matter to the individual with the thought, b) relative political actors cause there to be different values because it is virtually impossible for all politicians to have the same value and c) even if all members are in agreement, each member is not entirely self-aware of the intentions of other members of the group.

Therefore, if I’m winning this analysis, the resolution of what side gets to choose parametrics, not if parametrics for the debate is justified. The Aff gets to parametricize to a single individual. There are four justifications:

1. Ground skew- It is unreasonable to have the affirmative defend every individual ever because the negative can simply choose one who is in the worst possible position to have a moral obligation such as individuals in need having an obligation to individuals in more need—this makes it almost impossible for the aff to win. The affirmative must specify a class of people in order to have any kind of equal ground. Ground is key to fairness because debaters need access to reasonable offense for a debate to exist at all. And, they still have quality ground, they can win FW violations that apply to all actors in general, so there is no abuse.

2. My specific advocacy keeps me from shifting ground and expanding my advocacy to coopt neg harms – my specificity leaves no room for vagueness. Allowing the negative to select their advocacy from a variety of different positions checks back affirmative advocacy/framework choice; a specific advocacy for the negative is crucial to avoid being blindsided by the wide range of potential affirmative narrow advantages.

3. Breadth of Research- Parametrics increases breadth of research because debaters have to craft advocacies and answers to specific individuals, which exposes them to a wider variety of arguments and is therefore more educational. This increases the research that debaters have to do, and the burden is reasonable. There is no brightline between looking towards an individuals views and the views of a card, because both still express the beliefs of a particular author, so it is as reasonable as cutting empirics indicts.

4. Textuality- The resolution says “to be valued” which demands an actor that is doing the valuing, meaning the resolution requires specification, and as the affirmative having to prove the resolution true requires that I meet the textual interpretation. Prefer textual interpretations because the resolution is all we have before coming into the round.   
  
Therefore, I parametricize the resolution to the pope.

Part 2: Framework

I value **Morality**.

We are constrained to our vantage point as a being in this universe and that uniquely affects our capabilities to interpret it. All individual interpretations carry an equal weight of truth. **Steinhart[[1]](#footnote-1) 1 explains:**

“**In human consciousness, a part of the world is naturally aware of the whole world. The human mind is the eye with which the world looks at itself.** It is the self-mirroring, the self-reflection, of the world. **But since our minds are in the world, they are eyes that see themselves.** We are self-aware. **In human self-consciousness, the mirror reflects itself. But when a mirror reflects itself, it reflects its own reflection: it reflects itself reflecting itself forever, making a series of endlessly nested self-reflections**… The series of reflections in reflections is like a series of steps leading down into the deep underworld of the mind.Caves are labyrinths. Plato said that the world in which we live, move, and have our being is like a cave in which we are prisoners, and that all our experience is only shadows cast on cave-walls. For Nietzsche, the subterranean inner world is a cave haunted by vampires and ghosts. It is haunted by superstitious fears: fear of death, of ghosts, of hell, and of God… Nietzsche argues that **there are no interpretations or maps of the world from the outside. There are no external perspectives on the world. Nietzsche’s perspectivism is the theory that the human mind strives for realistic internal conceptual maps of the world.** It is an example of what Putnam, the 20th century American thinker, calls internal realism.

Morality must be from a person’s perspective because people consistently gain new knowledge, making their verdicts most indicative of the truth. **Anker[[2]](#footnote-2)**

As mentioned and affirmed**, all things** (concepts, words, objects, subjects, etc.) **are in a state of becoming. Gaining knowledge or insight into any of these particulars thus entails an unstable terrain. If some-thing is constantly in a state of also becoming some-thing other, there is no stable ground for absolute knowledge and judgment.** Furthermore, and to complicate matters even more so, **it is not only the object being considered that exists in a state of transformation, but also the “subject” doing the interpretation. What we have left is a thoroughly perspectival** (Nietzsche) **relation to viewing and interpreting what we see and know of this world.** By affirming this, **knowledge becomes not a ground or an end in itself, but the means for a continual perspectival shifting. Perspectivism,** as a thoroughly ungrounded and continuously shifting mode of interpretation, furthermore **affirms the uncertainty of an indeterminate subject, object, and conceptual becoming.**

.

Therefore, individuals are the only ones who can create value through an existentialist ethic. **Sartre explains the affirmative advocacy:**

“If one considers an article of manufacture as, for example, a book or **a paper-knife**– one sees that it**has been made by an artisan who had a conception of it;**and he has paid attention, equally, to the conception of a paper-knife and to the pre-existent technique of production which is a part of that conception and is, at bottom, a formula. **Thus the paper-knife**is at the same time an article producible in a certain manner and one which, on the other hand,**serves a definite purpose, for one cannot suppose that a man would produce a paper-knife without knowing what it was for.** Let us say,then, of the paperknifethatits essence – that is to say the sum of theformulae and thequalities which madeits production andits definition possible – precedes its existence**.**The presence of such-and-such a paper-knife or book is thus determined before my eyes. Here, then, we are viewing the world from a technical standpoint, and we can say that production precedes existence. When we think of God as the creator, we are thinking of him, most of the time, as a supernal artisan. Whatever doctrine we may be considering, whether it be a doctrine like that of Descartes, or of Leibnitz himself, we always imply that the will follows, more or less, from the understanding or at least accompanies it, so that when God creates he knows precisely what he is creating. Thus, the conception of man in the mind of God is comparable to that of the paper-knife in the mind of the artisan: God makes man according to a procedure and a conception, exactly as the artisan manufactures a paper-knife, following a definition and a formula. Thus each individual man is the realisation of a certain conception which dwells in the divine understanding. In the philosophic atheism of the eighteenth century, the notion of God is suppressed, but not, for all that, the idea that essence is prior to existence; something of that idea we still find everywhere, in Diderot, in Voltaire and even in Kant. Man possesses a human nature; that “human nature,” which is the conception of human being, is found in every man; which means that each man is a particular example of a universal conception, the conception of Man. In Kant, this universality goes so far that the wild man of the woods, man in the state of nature and the bourgeois are all contained in the same definition and have the same fundamental qualities. Here again, the essence of man precedes that historic existence which we confront in experience. Atheistic**existentialism**,of which I am a representative, **declares**with greater consistency**that**if God does not exist there is at least one being whose**[man’s] existence comes before its essence,**a being which exists before it can be defined by any conception of it.That being is man or, as Heidegger has it, the human reality. What do we mean by saying that existence precedes essence? We mean that**man first of all exists, encounters himself,**surges up in the world –**and defines himself afterwards.**If man as the existentialist sees him is not definable, it is because to begin with he is nothing**. He will not be anything until later, and then he will be what he makes of himself.** Thus, there is no human nature, because there is no God to have a conception of it. Man simply is. Not that he is simply what he conceives himself to be, but he is what he wills, and as he conceives himself after already existing – as he wills to be after that leap towards existence. Man is nothing else but that which he makes of himself. That is the first principle of existentialism. And this is what people call its “subjectivity,” using the word as a reproach against us. But what do we mean to say by this, but that man is of a greater dignity than a stone or a table? For we mean to say that man primarily exists – that man is, before all else, something which propels itself towards a future and is aware that it is doing so. Man is, indeed, a project which possesses a subjective life,instead of being a kind of moss, or a fungus or a cauliflower. Before that projection of the self nothing exists; not even in the heaven of intelligence: man will only attain existence when he is what he purposes to be. Not, however, what he may wish to be. For what we usually understand by wishing or willing is a conscious decision taken – much more often than not – after we have made ourselves what we are. I may wish to join a party, to write a book or to marry – but in such a case what is usually called my will is probably a manifestation of a prior and more spontaneous decision. If, however, it is true that existence is prior to essence, man is responsible for what he is. Thus, the first effect of existentialism is that it puts every man in possession of himself as he is, and places the entire responsibility for his existence squarely upon his own shoulders. And, when we say that man is responsible for himself, we do not mean that he is responsible only for his own individuality, but that he is responsible for all men. The word “subjectivism” is to be understood in two senses, and our adversaries play upon only one of them. Subjectivism means, on the one hand, the freedom of the individual subject and, on the other, that man cannot pass beyond human subjectivity. It is the latter which is the deeper meaning of existentialism.**When we say that man chooses himself, we *do* mean that every one of us must choose himself;** but by that we also mean that in choosing for himself he chooses for all men. For in effect**,** of all the actions a man may take in order to create himself as he wills to be, there is not one which is not creative, at the same time, of *an image of man such as he believes he ought to be*.” No one has decided for us what it means to be human. It remains entirely upon each of us individually to answer the question: ‘What should I do?’ And we answer this question not with some criteria handed down from above, but by recognizing that our actions actually determine what it means to be human. To act morally is to recognize our role as the creators, and not the subject, of ethics and to act accordingly. If we act with authentic moral deliberation, and create our own morality, than our choice can be nothing but correct**. Morality requires neither certain acts**, nor certain ends, **but merely that we consider our position and decide**.

Thus, the standard is **consistency with an existentialist ethic**, defined as allowing individuals to create their own ethical value. Prefer this standard additionally because:

1. Alternative moral systems to existentialism rely on the possibility of an objective morality to serve as a guide for what we ought and ought not do. However, any such morality that claims existence outside of human creation is flawed, because what can be said to exist are only facts and not values. **Ludwig Wittgenstein writes[[3]](#footnote-3):**

The essence of this difference seems to be obviously this: **Every judgment of relative value** is a mere statement of facts and **can** therefore **be put in such a form that it loses all the appearance of a judgment of value:** Instead of saying "This is the right way to Granchester," I could equally well have said, ‘This is the right way you have to go if you want to get to Granchester in the shortest time**’;**"This man is a good runner" simply means that he runs a certain number of miles in a certain number of minutes, etc. Now what I wish to contend is that, although all judgments of relative value can be shown to be mere statement of facts, no statement of fact can ever be, or imply, a judgment of absolute value**.** Let me explain this: **Suppose** one of **you were an omniscient person** and therefore knew all the movements of all the bodies in the world dead or alive and that he also knew all the states of mind of all human beings that ever lived, **and** suppose this man **wrote** allhe knew **in a big book ,**then this book would contain **the whole description of the world;** and what I want to say is, that **this book would contain nothing that we would call an ethical judgment or anything that would logically imply such a judgment.** It would of course contain all relative judgments of value and all true scientific propositions and in fact all true propositions that can be made. But **all the facts described would,** as it were, **stand on the same level and in the same way all propositions stand on the same level.** There are no propositions which, in any absolute sense, are sublime, important, or trivial.

2. Even if there were an objectively true morality, any attempt to determine its content is undermined by individuals’ subjectivity. **Sartre 2 explains[[4]](#footnote-4):**

If an angel appears to me, what is the proof that it is an angel; or, **if I hear voices, who can prove that they proceed from heaven and not from**hell, or from **my own subconscious or some pathological condition?**Who can prove that they are really addressed to me? **Who, then, can prove that I am the proper person to impose, by my own choice, my conception of man upon mankind?**I shall never find any proof whatever; there will be no sign to convince me of it. If a voice speaks to me, **it is still I myself who must decide whether the voice is** or is not**that of an angel. If I regard a certain course of action as good, it is only I who choose to say that it is good and not bad.”**

3. Objectivist moral systems paradoxically treat people as objects, undermining their own foundation. **Sartre 3 argues that existentialism[[5]](#footnote-5):**

In the second place, this theory **alone is compatible with the dignity of man, it is the only one which does not make man into an object. All kinds of materialism lead one to treat every man including oneself as an object – that is, as a set of pre-determined reactions, in no way different from the patterns of qualities** and phenomenawhich constitute a table,or a chair or **a stone. Our aim is precisely to establish the human kingdom as a pattern of values in distinction from the material world.**

4. All ethical theories collapse into infinite regress, meaning individuals give weight to ethical claims. **Macintyre writes:**

“**An agent can only justify a** particular **judgment by referring to some universal rule from which it may be** logically **derived,** and can only justify that rule in turn by deriving it from some more general rule or principle; **but** on this view **since every chain of reasoning must be finite, such a process** of justificatory reasoning **must always terminate with the assertion of some rule** or principle **for which no further reason can be given**. Each individual implicitly or explicitly has to adopt his or her own first principles on the basis of such a choice. **The utterance of any universal principle is an expression of the preferences** of for that will its principles have and itthem by adopting them.”However, that does not mean morality in and of its self cannot exist, therefore, I present the following burden analysisan individual will **and can have only such authority as [one] chooses to confer upon [it]**.

My advocacy text is that Pope Benedict XVI, head of the catholic church, believes that rehabilitation should be prioritized over retribution.

His views couldn’t be any clearer. Any system that functions with retribution over rehabilitation fails to meet his criteria. **CWN[[6]](#footnote-6):**

**The criminal-justice system must strive to rehabilitate convicts** as well as to punish them, Pope Benedict XVI said in an address to a group of European prison officials. "In order to practice justice it is not enough that those found guilty of crimes be simply punished**: it is necessary that in punishing them, everything possible be done to correct and improve them,**” **the Pope said.** “**When this does not happen, justice is not done in an integral sense.**” In fact, the Pontiff continued, **a prison system that punishes criminals without providing for rehabilitation** “**paradoxically reinforces rather than overcomes the tendency to commit crime and the threat posed to society by the individual.”** At a time when crime rates are rising in many societies, the Pope said, **prison systems should do their utmost to “bring about the offender’s effective re-education, which is required both for the sake of his own dignity and with a view to his reintegration into society**.

Moreover, this affirms since:

1. The Pope creates his identity with his focus on the symbol of rehabilitation. **Macon**[[7]](#footnote-7)**:**

**Role theory** builds on symbolic interactionism by linking **[links] symbols with roles**. “In this usage, **positions are symbols for the kinds of persons it is possible to be in society: rich man, poor man, thief, fool, teacher**, sergeant, intellectual, rebel, president, and so on and on” (Stryker, 1980, p. 57). Stryker (1980) elaborated on earlier work by George Herbert Mead in the area of symbolic interactionism. **Symbols are important components of social activities, such as volunteering**. Stryker writes “**Symbols enable people to predict their own and other’s behavior and to anticipate the future course of interaction**” (1980, p. 37). **Thus,** **an individual may add the role of volunteer to his or her definition of self.**

2. Self-Interested individuals would only enter into an ethical commitment where they are forced to prioritize rehabilitation if they wanted to that as a public belief. As such the Pope, means that they have this ethical belief.

Underview 1:

**A. States’ economies are vital to the national economy and need change NOW.**

**Funkhouser 12** (Mark [director of the Governing Institute, PhD expert on auditing] “Why the State Budget Crisis is Real” Governing Institute, Aug 13, 2012, MG)

So which is it, no biggie or major crisis? And does it matter much? I'll answer the second question first. Yes, it matters a great deal. **State governments are responsible for** providing most **domestic** governmental **functions such as** public **education**, **health** and **welfare** services, **and public safety** and corrections. **States** and localities **finance three-quarters of our infrastructure, employ 19 million workers and spent** a combined **$2.5 trillion in 2009**, **which is more than the federal government spent** on the direct implementation of domestic policy.¶ Is there a crisis? The task force report makes a convincing case that the **problems states face are structural**, not cyclical, and that **states' current policy** and governance trajectory **is unsustainable.** Financial problems of a cyclical nature will improve as the economy recovers, but structural problems will persist irrespective of the business cycle. **That's a crisis. Serious policy changes are needed.**¶The task force cites six major threats to fiscal sustainability, each of which is enough to sink a state financially: **Medicaid is the** single **largest state expenditure** **and is growing faster than both the economy and state tax revenues**; **federal aid** is the largest source of state revenue and **will** surely **be cut** deeply given the financial situation **in Washington**; state pension systems are underfunded to the tune of at least $1 trillion, even holding aside state obligations for health-care benefits for retirees; the states' tax bases have been eroding for decades and are increasingly volatile; the increasing fiscal distress of many local governments will negatively impact the states; and finally, **the budget practices of states** — "kicking the can down the road" — **hinder fiscal stability and mask imbalances**.

**And, US economic collapse means multiple scenarios for nuclear conflict – extinction.**

**Friedberg and Schoenberg 8** (Aaron [Prof of Politics and IR at Princeton], Gabriel [senior editor for commentary at WSJ] “The Dangers of a Diminished America” Wall Street Journal, 2008, MG)

Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future?¶ Meanwhile, tsraditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. **The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist** affiliates has **not** been **extinguished**. **Iran and North Korea** are continuing **on** their **bellicose paths**, while **Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing** smartly down the road **to chaos**. **Russia's** new **militancy** **and China's** seemingly relentless **rise** **also give** cause for **concern**.¶ If **America** now tries to **pull back from the world stage**, it **will leave a** dangerous **power vacuum**. The **stabilizing effects** of our presence **in Asia**, our continuing **commitment to Europe, and** our position as **defender of** last resort for **Middle East energy sources** and supply lines could **all** be **placed at risk**.¶ In such a scenario **there are shades of the 1930s**, **when global** trade and **finance ground** nearly **to a halt**, the **peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers** led by the remorseless fanatics who **rose up on** the crest of **economic disaster** exploited their divisions. **Today** we run the risk that **rogue states may choose to become** ever more **reckless with** their **nuclear toys**, just **at** **our** moment of **maximum vulnerability.**¶ The aftershocks of the financial crisis will almost certainly rock our principal strategic competitors even harder than they will rock us. The dramatic free fall of the Russian stock market has demonstrated the fragility of a state whose economic performance hinges on high oil prices, now driven down by the global slowdown. China is perhaps even more fragile, its economic growth depending heavily on foreign investment and access to foreign markets. Both will now be constricted, inflicting economic pain and perhaps even sparking unrest in a country where political legitimacy rests on progress in the long march to prosperity.¶ None of this is good news if the authoritarian leaders of these countries seek to divert attention from internal travails with external adventures.

**B. Retributive policies have put major strains on state economies.**

**Andrews and Bonta 10** (DA [Carleton University] and James [Public Safety Canada] “Rehabilitating Criminal Justice Policy and Practice” American Psychological Association, 2010, MG)

**Over the past 35 years**, the trend in **dealing with criminal[s]** offenders **became increasingly** harsh and **punitive**. The message was clear: offenders were not to be mollycoddled. The U.S. Parole Commission and many states abolished their paroling authorities. Instead, parole was replaced with “truth-in-sentencing” legislation (Holt, 1998) and “three strikes and you’re out” laws (Turner, Greenwood, Chen, & Fain, 1999). Boot camps and “Scared Straight” programs sprung up throughout the United States and abroad. There were even calls to make probation as “punishing as prison” (Erwin, 1986, p. 17). The **rehabilitation** of offenders, an important activity for many correctional psychologists, **was devalued in favor of** the “**get tough**” approach for dealing with offenders. The accumulating evidence is that the **retribution** movement **has been a disastrous failure**. Sentencing guidelines and the various truth-in-sentencing laws that require a minimum sentence to be served before release have resulted in longer sentences and more crowded prisons (Wood & Dunaway, 2003). The **three strikes laws** further **compounded** the problem of **prison growth** without any evidence that prison sentences reduce recidivism (Doob & Webster, 2003; Smith, Goggin, & Gendreau, 2002; von Hirsch, Bottoms, Burney, & Wikstro¨m, 1999). The tough new sanctions of boot camps, electronic monitoring, and Scared Straight programs that expose at-risk young offenders to prison life have had either a negligible or detrimental impact on recidivism (MacKenzie & Armstong, 2004; Petrosino, Turpin-Petrosino, & Finckenauer, 2000; Renzema & MayoWilson, 2005). All of **this has caused a tremendous strain on state economies**, with 22 states cutting corrections budgets for ﬁscal year 2010 (Scott-Hayward, 2009). Only Medicaid has out-paced corrections budgets (Stemen, 2007) and, in 2008, it was estimated that **state budgets for corrections were in excess of $52 billion** (Pew, 2009). **The incarceration and re-entry of large numbers** of adults **has** a number of less visible **costs**. Many prisons are far removed from the neighborhoods where offenders reside. For example, **in New York** State, almost all of the prisons are located upstate with 60% of the prisoners coming from the poorest borough of New York City. Many of these neighborhoods have high concentrations of **offenders** who **are sent** to **upstate** prisons **at an annual cost of over $30[k]**,000. It has been estimated that Brooklyn alone has 35 blocks where the costs of imprisonment exceeds **$1 million per block** (Gonnerman, 2004). The neighborhood of Brewer Park, Detroit has an annual cost of $2.9 million (Pew, 2009). Not only is there a signiﬁcant cost in imprisoning people from poor neighborhoods, but additional **ﬁnancial hardships are placed upon the families of offenders and the communities where they reside**. A family may lose a breadwinner and even during incarceration, the family may still continue to support the offender. Offenders released from prisons return to their communities with **poor job prospects, and** their **idle presence on the streets discourage the frequenting of local businesses**. **This** in turn **threatens business success**, thereby **eroding the tax base** for many cities (Clear, 2008).

**And, rehab is much cheaper – solves states’ economies.**

**Causey 12** (James E [Editorial writer, columnist & blogger for the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel] “Treatment is the best way to fight crime” Journal Sentinel, Nov 27, 2012, MG)

Contrary to popular belief, the Wisconsin prison system is not packed with killers. Since 1996, **80% of** the **growth in** the **prison population** in Wisconsin **has been** attributed to **drug and alcohol use**. This figure mirrors national statistics. Here's the problem: **The** state average **cost of** **putting someone** **behind bars for a year is $32,000,** **while the most expensive treatment program costs less than $8,000**. I'm not a financial whiz, but it makes more sense to spend $8,000 on people and turn them into a productive member of society, rather than pay $32,000 to incarcerate them. **Every dollar spent on treatment programs saves** almost $**2 in** criminal justice **costs**, according to the Wisconsin Office of Justice Assistance. Using that yardstick, **an investment of $75 million on the front end in alternatives** to prison programs **would lead to annual savings o**f almost $**150 million**. These findings are outlined in a report released Wednesday by Human Impact Partners and WISDOM. "Healthier Lives, Stronger Families, Safer Communities" looks at the impact of drug and alcohol and mental health treatment courts, based on the principle that public health issues are at the root of many crimes. Since 2006, **after** the state Legislature put $**1 million per year into** the **Treatment Alternatives and Diversion programs**, there has been **a decline in the recidivism rates** in the seven piloted locations. **In Milwaukee**, for example, **crime decreased 23% since** 2007, the year TAD **programs went into effect.** Specifically, homicide and rape have decreased between 4% and 5%, and theft and auto theft dropped 17% and 27%, respectively. Most notably, Milwaukee had **a 14% decline in inmate population** at the county jail and County Correctional Facility-South between 2008 and 2010. John Chisholm, the Milwaukee County district attorney, said **cutting crime rates while reducing** the number of those **incarcerated should be the goal.**
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